DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 790 HE 031 519

AUTHOR	Dice, Marvin L.; Diederich, Ronald; Gammon, Nancy W.; Schultze, Betty; Starr, Robert
TITLE	Including General and Special Education: Initiatives of One Small Historically Black College.
INSTITUTION	Harris-Stowe State Coll., St. Louis, MO. Teacher Education Dept.
SPONS AGENCY	Missouri State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City.
PUB DATE	1996-00-00
NOTE	24p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Colleges; Curriculum Development; Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inclusive Schools; Knowledge Level; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Special Education; State Colleges; Teacher Collaboration; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS	*Harris Stowe State College MO

ABSTRACT

This paper describes initial activities to revise the existing preservice teacher education curriculum to accommodate inclusion of students with disabilities and to improve collaboration between regular and special educators at Harris Stowe State College (Missouri), an historically black college. The identification of institutional and attitudinal barriers led to an institute and retreat attended by 10 regular and special education faculty. Additionally, a module about inclusion was developed and presented to students (n=20) enrolled in one section of the Foundations of Education class. The module involved viewing two video tapes and an in-class workshop given by a local school district inclusion facilitator. The Inclusion Knowledge and Self-Report Inventory was administered to both faculty and students before and after these activities were conducted. Findings indicated that even prior to the activities both students and faculty possessed a high degree of knowledge about inclusion, as well as having favorable attitudes toward inclusion. Additionally, feedback from both faculty and students identified specific aspects of inclusion in which they desired more training. (Contains 13 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running head: Including General and Special Education: Initiatives

ED 422 790

Including General and Special Education: Initiatives of One Small Historically Black College

Marvin L. Dice, Ronald Diederich, Nancy W. Gammon, Betty Schultze, and Robert Starr

Harris Stowe State College

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marvin L. Dice

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

With funding from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, regular and special education faculty of a historically Black college participated in an institute and a retreat to acquire knowledge about inclusion and develop the necessary partnership to assist in a preservice curricular revision. Regular education students in one section of a required course received a module on inclusive education by viewing two video tapes and participating in an in-class workshop given by a local school district inclusion facilitator. Faculty and student participants were assessed on the Inclusion Knowledge Survey Report Inventory (IKSRI) to determine what they knew as well as what attitudes they held about inclusion. Also, student respondents were asked to provide feedback by rating the importance they attached to learning specific inclusion skills that were presented in the module. Faculty respondents were asked to make suggestions regarding possible changes in the preservice curriculum. Investigators were surprised to find that faculty and students were quite knowledgeable about inclusion and held favorable opinions about it. This is in contrast with a recently published finding in Phi Delta Kappan in which the majority of respondents believed that children with learning problems should be placed in special class. The authors describe efforts of a small historically Black institution to reconfigure its preservice curriculum to accommodate demands of inclusive education. They concluded that similar initiatives which model the reform and restructuring process in schools should take place in other colleges and universities if institutions of higher education are to seriously meet the demands of a rapidly changing world

Including General and Special Education: Initiatives:

of One Small Historically Black College

In today's classroom, teachers are finding themselves in more and more situations in which they are being asked to accommodate the learning and social needs of culturally diverse, at risk learners and other learners with disabilities. In many schools the great majority of students are reluctant learners. These individuals, who may be struggling academically or socially, may be at risk in their private lives and they often live in disordered communities (Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg, 1995). Even if one believes that these students do not represent a major challenge for the traditionally trained regular teacher, certainly the two thirds of the nation's exceptional children who spend the majority of their days in integrated classrooms (West, Idol, & Cannon, 1989) do present such challenges. To further compound the problem, a disproportionate number of at risk pupils are members of racial and ethnic minorities. For those involved, these challenges often require the resources and technical expertise of regular as well as special educators. Unfortunately in many schools the problem is ignored and it is still the norm that general educators focus, for example, primarily on how to teach literature, mathematics and science. In contrast, special educators focus on behavior management, diagnostic and prescriptive approaches and intervention strategies for teaching unconventional learners (Yatvin, 1995). Although common sense suggests that regular and special education teachers need to work together, this lack of collaboration is not surprising when one looks at most preservice teacher preparation programs in which special education is viewed as a separate system. In 1990, only 37 states required regular educators to take courses in special education (Patton & Braithwaite, 1990), and most institutions of teacher education programs required only one special education course (Fender, & Fielder, 1990). This course seems to focus either on the characteristics of students with various disabilities or modifications in curriculum, instruction and learning environments (Jones &Messenheimer-Young, 1989). With regular teacher preparation programs giving a

superficial view of the special education teacher in the profession and those entering the schools rarely seeing the need to work with special educators, in the education of the at risk students, it is little wonder that the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE,1992) has recommended "collaborative partnerships and joint training programs between general and special educators" (p.5). It was in response to such a request from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education of the State of Missouri that Harris-Stowe State College (HSSC) submitted a proposal and received funding to develop collaborative preservice teacher education preparation to support inclusive educational efforts and to prepare teachers to work together to meet the learning needs of all students.

Inherent Institutional Barriers

Although the philosophy of the special education program reflects the theme of the knowledge base of the HSSC Teacher Education Department, namely "Teachers for a Diverse Society," collaborative activities which occurred in the department were primarily formal. These activities included course approval, and changes or deletions which were proposed by special educators and routinely passed by members of the Teacher Education Committee and/or the Teacher Education Department. Seldom did these meetings specifically address the issues of collaborative and inclusive education and rarely would general and special education faculty discuss such matters informally. Therefore, it appeared that even in a small department certain barriers existed which hindered the development of collaboration. As such, we hypothesized that the following barriers had to be overcome before such a partnership could occur:

1. A lack of understanding by regular education faculty of special education concepts and terminology, e.g., "inclusive education' and "full inclusion," and teaching strategies for accommodating students with disabilities.

2. An institutional bureaucracy that does not support reconfiguration of training programs to support inclusive education.

3. A teacher preparation program for general and special education students that

does not focus adequately on the skills and knowledge to effectively manage exceptional diversity in inclusive classrooms.

4. A lack of scheduled informal time for general and special education faculty to openly discuss plausible curricular change that would facilitate and support inclusive education.

Elimination of Barriers

Because department and committee meetings seldom addressed the issues of inclusive and collaborative education, it appeared that additional activities would be necessary to eliminate inherent institutional barriers to the development of inclusive educational practice. Therefore, we hypothesized that the following activities would be helpful in eliminating these barriers:

1. Provide an inservice to the Teacher Education Department on inclusion knowledge, strategies, and processes, that facilitate and support inclusive education.

2. Schedule a faculty retreat to develop common knowledge and terminology and collaboration between department faculty that would assist in the reconfiguration of preservice regular and special education courses.

3. Survey faculty and students with regard to their knowledge and beliefs about inclusion.

4. Provide a module on inclusion to regular education students in a course which has traditionally not offered inclusion content and solicit feedback.

Faculty Activities

The participants consisted of 10 department faculty who were sufficiently interested in the project to participate in the inservice and the faculty retreat. Because of the difficulty in finding a day on which all faculty could attend a one day inservice, department faculty were asked to select one day of the two days during which the 4th Annual Institute for Inclusive Education was held in St. Louis, Missouri. The Institute was viewed as an excellent opportunity because it allowed faculty who were scheduled to

teach on Monday to attend on Tuesday and faculty who were scheduled to teach on Tuesday to attend on Monday. Fortunately, seven faculty were able to attend one whole day and, of the three who were not able to attend for a whole day, only one attended less than three sessions. Because the institute included a variety of topics, e.g., dealing with challenging behavior, it provided an appropriate means for additional knowledge and perceptions regarding inclusive education.

In contrast to the institute, the second scheduled faculty activity, the retreat, lasted for less than 1/2 day and addressed very specific objectives. During the retreat, faculty were given information regarding the current status of the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), shown the video, "DeMything Inclusion" and asked to generate concrete suggestions regarding the reconfiguration of preservice curriculum. These suggestions were later given to the inclusion steering committee whose members refined and put the suggestions into the form of a recommendation to the Teacher Education Department whose members decided which regular education courses should include material related to inclusion.

Student Activities

Student participants consisted of 20 individuals enrolled in one section of Foundations of Education. Because these students had not officially declared an interest in the field of special education and, in the past, this course had not served as a mechanism for delivering information about inclusive education, we presented an inclusion module and solicited feedback that might prove useful in the reconfiguration of our preservice curriculum. As such, students received information about inclusion by (a) viewing two video tapes, and (b) participating in an in-class workshop given by a local school district inclusion facilitator. First they were shown "DeMything Inclusion," the same tape shown to the faculty, and then they viewed,"Strategies for Co-Planning and Co-Teaching". Both of these videos were selected from a series entitled "The Master Teacher." The in-class workshop, provided an additional and meaningful dimension to the pilot because the

facilitator discussed not only inclusion strategies, but also shared his own experiences with inclusion as the parent of a child with multiple disabilities.

Survey and Findings

In order to determine what faculty and students knew and what attitudes they possessed about inclusion, the Inclusion Knowledge and Self-Report Inventory (IKSRI) was administered before proceeding with inclusion activities. The inventory consisted of the following three components:

1. Demographic characteristics of the respondents
2. Knowledge and concepts about PL-94-142, IDEA, mainstreaming, inclusion, full inclusion, and collaboration.
3. Beliefs about inclusive educational practice.

The demographic component consisted of five inventory items, and the second and third components consisted of twenty inventory items each. The demographic component asked standard questions such as the participants gender or latest degree earned. Items for the knowledge component used a true-false format and consisted of statements such as "inclusion is stated in all federal mandates involving special education." Ten of these items were selected from questions asked and answered in the first video, "DeMything Inclusion," which participating faculty and students viewed later. The remaining 10 items were adapted into questions from statements made in the same video. The third component of the inventory was a constructed summated-rating 20 item scale, which asked participants to select responses that best indicated their beliefs or perceptions about inclusion on a 5-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Two of these survey items, namely items 3 and 20 were developed to detect the possibility that participants would attempt to fake favorable opinions about inclusion in order to appear socially or politically appropriate. Similar items were used in the development of the Multicultural Self-Report Inventory (Slade & Wyatt, 1989). For these latter two items a high or low score had no relation to either favorable nor

unfavorable beliefs about inclusion. For some of the remaining items a high score indicated favorable beliefs about inclusion, in which respondents strongly agreed and for others items a low score indicated favorable beliefs about inclusion, in which respondents strongly disagreed. The IKSRI is displayed in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Findings

The data from the survey revealed that both faculty and student respondents possessed a high degree of knowledge about inclusion. In the area of knowledge about inclusion, the student respondent groups mean score was15.95, and faculty respondent groups mean score was 18.00. This meant that students who had received no formal inclusion training were answering approximately 75% of the questions correctly, and faculty who had not yet participated in the institute or retreat were answering approximately 90% of the questions correctly. The group mean scores for faculty and students are displayed in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Additionally, and perhaps more surprising was the general favorableness of opinion which students and faculty appeared to possess about inclusion. On the student rating scale the average mean score for the positively marked items, in which a high score indicated a favorable opinion about inclusion, was 4.08. The average mean score for the negatively marked items, in which a low score indicated a favorable opinion, was 1.54.

Table 2 displays the mean scores for each negatively, positively and neutral marked item. The average mean scores for positively and negatively marked items were calculated from this data.

Insert Table 2 about here

Similarly on the faculty rating scale the average mean score for the positively marked items which indicate a favorable opinion about inclusion was 4.33. The average mean score for the negatively marked items which indicate an unfavorable opinion was 1.46. Table 3 displays the mean scores for each positively, negatively, and neutral marked item. The average mean scores for each positively and negatively marked item were calculated from this data.

Insert Table 3 about here

These average mean scores for both positively and negatively marked items indicated that both faculty and students held very favorable beliefs about inclusion. Additionally, both student and faculty groups showed very little tendency to fake favorable opinions about inclusion as indicated by the somewhat neutral scores (undecided opinions) offered in response to items 3 and 20. The authors believed that participants concerned with selecting the socially appropriate response would indicate that they liked all children with disabilities equally by strongly disagreeing with items 3 and 20. However, on these items the average mean score for students and faculty was a somewhat neutral 3.475 and 3.15 respectively.

These findings of favorable opinions about inclusion seemed especially noteworthy in view of the Elam and Rose (1995) Phi Delta Kappan/Gallup Poll report that "two thirds of the respondents believed that children with learning problems should be placed in special class"(p.48), and that "the proponents of greater inclusion have a public relations problem" (p. 49). It was especially interesting to note that both group means for

respondents was 4.0 or greater on item 12. This suggests that participants believed that classrooms with students with disabilities will enhance the learning of all students. Additionally, because the mean rating for faculty and student groups on item one were 4.2 and 4.75 respectively, survey results indicated that respondents were very interested in learning more about students with disabilities. Finally, the fact that items 14, 15, 16,17, and 18 received very favorable ratings from both groups indicated that participants were very interested in learning more about how to (a) modify curricula, (b) use instructional strategies such as cooperative learning, (c) learn collaborative teaming strategies, (d) find effective ways to manage difficult students and identify resources to facilitate the inclusion of more students in the regular classroom. This was perhaps because participants were either personally aware of the heterogeneous student population that exists in schools and society today or had experienced the need to learn more about how to accommodate diversity.

Additional Feedback from Students

To obtain feedback from student respondents regarding the inclusion module and determine how importantly students valued learning specific skills associated with inclusion, after the in-class workshop, a brief questionnaire was administered. In this questionnaire the 20 students who received the module on inclusion were asked: (a) whether additional preparation in meeting the needs of disabled students would enhance their professional development, and (b) how important they believed it was to learn behavior management, co-teaching, cooperative learning, and curriculum modification skills. The results of this student feedback is displayed in Table 4

Insert Table 4 about here

On the first question the mean rating of 4.04 indicated that students felt feel that additional preparation related to inclusion would be valuable. On the second question,

students gave behavior management a 4.65, the highest rating. Curriculum modification received a 4.56, the second highest rating, and co-teaching and cooperative learning were rated at 4.38 and 4.40 respectively. These ratings indicated that students believed these skills were very important.

Additional Feedback from Faculty

To understand faculty perceptions regarding the reconfiguration of our preservice curriculum, faculty were asked a series of questions during the concluding moments of the faculty retreat. Their reflections provided the inclusion project's steering committee with valuable feedback with which to make decisions regarding their formal recommendations to the Teacher Education Department. See Figure 2 for typical comments.

Insert Figure 2 about here

Discussion

The major purposes of the project were to (a) acquire increased knowledge and skill for more effectively managing diversity in inclusive educational environments, and (b) begin reconfiguring curriculum to insure that both general and special education students receive greater knowledge about inclusive education, were accomplished.

For faculty, participation at the Institute for Inclusive Education and the faculty retreat provided a variety of sources of knowledge and the opportunity to begin the process of reconfiguring the preservice curriculum. In addition, the information acquired from students during the student pilot and the student pilot feedback session near the end of the semester provided important data for faculty to consider in beginning the process of reconfiguration.

An unexpected result occurred when we found that faculty and student respondents possessed a high degree of knowledge and held favorable beliefs about inclusion. That our respondents held favorable opinions about inclusion was not expected

because it had been shown in the literature that most respondents thought children with learning problems should be placed in special class (Elam & Rose, 1995). Additionally, we were successful in initiating the process of examining our preservice curriculum to better prepare future teachers to meet the needs of all students. Finally, like others, Dice, 1995; Duchnowski, & Danforth, 1993; Englert, Tarrant & Mariage, 1992; Goodlad & Lovitt, 1993; John, 1992) who believe teacher preparation programs in higher education must model the reform and restructuring demands in schools, we found that both our faculty and students were willing to embrace this challenge.

Increasingly, regular educators are being asked to meet the learning and social needs of culturally diverse, at risk, and mildly disabled learners. Educators at all levels must learn new skills and play new roles if they are to cope with the challenges that lie ahead. Institutions of higher education must first model and assist future teacher to prepare for the learning needs of the students they will encounter. The need for collaboration between general and special education faculty is vital to the development of preservice programs that prepare future teachers to meet the needs of all students.

References

Dice, M. L. (1995). No one package model: Divergent strategies for teaching individuals with problem behaviors. In F. E. Obiakor & B. Algozzine (Eds.) Managing problem behaviors behaviors: Perspectives for general and special educators. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Elam, S. M, & Rose, L. C. (1995). The 27th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 77, 41-56.

Englert, C., Tarrant, K., & Mariage, T. (1992). Defining and redefining instructional practice in special education: Perspectives on good teaching. Teacher Education and Special Education, 15, 62-87.

Fender, M. J., & Fielder, C. (1990). Preservice preparation of regular educators: A national survey of curricular content in introductory exceptional children and youth courses.Teacher Education and Special Education, 19, 572-579.

Goodlad, J. (1994). The national network for educational renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 75,632-638.

John, D. (1992). No more winners and losers: Collaborative learning in the college classroom. Journal of the National Association of Adults with Special Learning Needs, 2, 31-38.

Jones, S. D., & Messenheimer-Young, T. (1989). Content of special education courses for preservice regular education teachers. Teacher Education and Special Education, 12, 154-159.

Paul, J., Duchnowski, A., & Danforth, S. (1993). Changing the way we do our business: One departments story of collaboration with public schools. Teacher Education and Special Education, 16, 95-109.

Patton, J. M., & Braithwaite, R. (1990). Special education certification/recertification for regular educators. The Journal of Special Education, 24 , 117-124.

Slade, J. C., & Conoley, C. W. (1989). Multicultural experiences for special educators. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22, 60-64.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1995). Serving students at the margins. Educational Leadership,52 , 12-17.

West, F. J., Idol, L., & Cannon, G. (1989). Collaboration in the schools. Austin, TX: Pro-ed.

Yatvin, J. (1995). Flawed assumptions. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 82-84.

Table 1

Faculty and Student Knowledge About Inclusion

Faculty Group (N=10) Mean.	Student Group (N=20) Mean
18.00	15.95

Table 2

Mean Item Student Ratings on Inclusion Beliefs

Item	SD 1	MD 2	U 3	MA 4	SA 5
1. I am interested in learning more about children with disabilities. (+)					4.75
2. I have enough knowledge regarding children with disabilities to teach in the regular classroom. (-)	1.35				
3. I seem to like some students with disabilities better than others. (0)			3.40		
4. Students with disabilities and students without disabilities will receive a better education when taught in the regular classroom. (-)	1.18				
5. I am comfortable around most people with disabilities. (+)			3.5		
6. Including students with disabilities in the regular classroom impedes the academic and social progress of students without disabilities. (-)		2.26			
7. I feel I can take the point of view of a child with disabilities. (+)			3.5		
8. Regular education classrooms are too advanced for students with disabilities. (-)	1.55				
9. Students with severe disabilities can benefit from the activities of the regular classroom. (+)			3.25		
10. To include students with disabilities in a regular education classroom, the teacher will have to lower his/her expectations for students without disabilities. (-)	1.5				
11. A regular education teacher can be effective in helping students with disabilities. (+)				3.9	
12. Classrooms that include students with and without disabilities enhance the learning experiences of all students. (+)				4.1	
13. I believe that including students with disabilities in the regular education classroom is an important part of a schools curriculum. (+)			3.55		
14. I believe that regular education teacher should learn a variety of ways to adapt or modify curricula so that students with diverse abilities are able to participate in regular education classrooms. (+)				4.45	
15. Regular education teachers should learn how to use instructional strategies such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring to help students access the regular education curriculum. (+)				4.55	
16. Regular and special education teachers need to learn collaborative teaming strategies (+).				4.60	
17. Regular education teachers need to find effective ways to manage difficult students (+).				4.70	
18. Regular education teachers need to identify resources to help effectively include more students in regular education classrooms. (+)				4.20	
19. Only people with disabilities can really understand and empathize with other people with disabilities. (-)	1.45				
20. I would prefer to teach children labeled with some disability categories better than others. (0)			3.55		

Note: High scores for positively marked items indicate a favorable opinion about inclusion. Low scores for negatively marked items also indicate a favorable opinion about inclusion. Items 3 and 20 indicate neither favorable or unfavorable opinions about inclusion

Table 3

Mean Item Faculty Ratings on Inclusion Beliefs

Item	SD 1	MD 2	U 3	MA 4	SA 5
1. I am interested in learning more about children with disabilities. (+)				4.20	
2. I have enough knowledge regarding children with disabilities to teach in the regular classroom. (-)		2.10			
3. I seem to like some students with disabilities better than others. (0)			3.10		
4. Students with disabilities and students without disabilities will receive a better education when taught in the regular classroom. (-)		1.50			
5. I am comfortable around most people with disabilities. (+)				4.30	
6. Including students with disabilities in the regular classroom impedes the academic and social progress of students without disabilities. (-)	1.00				
7. I feel I can take the point of view of a child with disabilities. (+)		2.10			
8. Regular education classrooms are too advanced for students with disabilities. (-)		1.60			
9. Students with severe disabilities can benefit from the activities of the regular classroom. (+)				4.00	
10. To include students with disabilities in a regular education classroom, the teacher will have to lower his/her expectations for students without disabilities. (-)	1.40				
11. A regular education teacher can be effective in helping students with disabilities. (+)				4.40	
12. Classrooms that include students with and without disabilities enhance the learning experiences of all students. (+)				4.20	
13. I believe that including students with disabilities in the regular education classroom is an important part of a schools curriculum. (+)				4.60	
14. I believe that regular education teacher should learn a variety of ways to adapt or modify curricula so that students with diverse abilities are able to participate in regular education classrooms. (+)					4.90
15. Regular education teachers should learn how to use instructional strategies such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring to help students access the regular education curriculum. (+)					4.90
16. Regular and special education teachers need to learn collaborative teaming strategies. (+)					4.80
17. Regular education teachers need to find effective ways to manage difficult students. (+)					4.90
18. Regular education teachers need to identify resources to help effectively include more students in regular education classrooms. (+)					4.70
19. Only people with disabilities can really understand and empathize with other people with disabilities. (-)	1.20				
20. I would prefer to teach children labeled with some disability categories better than others. (0)			3.20		

Note: High scores for positively marked items indicate a favorable opinion about inclusion. Low scores for negatively marked items also indicate a favorable opinion about inclusion. Items 3 and 20 indicate neither favorable or unfavorable opinions about inclusion

Table 4

Inclusion Feedback Questionaire Ratings

1.	Additional Preparation in Meetings the Needs of Disabled Students Would Enhance My Professional Development				
	1	2	3	4	5
	strongly disagree				strongly agree
				x	
2.	How Important Do You Believe It Is To Learn the Following Skills				
	1	2	3	4	5
	not very important				very important
Behavior Management					x
Co-teaching				x	
Cooperative Learning				x	
Curriculum Modification					x

n =20

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Inclusion Knowledge and Self Report Inventory

Figure 2. Typical Faculty Comments

Inclusion Knowledge and Self Report Inventory

Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. Your answers will help us understand what you currently know and believe about Inclusive Education. All responses will be confidential and only aggregate results will be recorded.

Section I:

Please provide the following information about yourself.

1. Male ____ Female____

2. Latest degree earned:
Ph.D./Ed.D.____ Specialist ____ Masters + 30 Hours ____
Masters ____ Bachelors ___ High School/GED ____

3. I have a friend or relative who has disabilities:

Yes___ No ___

4. Years of Teaching Experience: ____

5. No of years since I participated in a preservice/inservice session related to students with disabilities:____

Section II.

Please indicate whether you believe the following are true (T) or False (F).

1. Inclusion means all students with disabilities will be in the regular classroom 100 percent of the time. (T or F)

2. Inclusion and mainstreaming are the same thing. (T or F)

3. The term "inclusion" is stated in all federal mandates involving special education. (T or F)

4. Inclusion means that the regular classroom teacher will be solely responsible for educating students with disabilities in addition to students without disabilities. (T or F)

5. Teaming and sharing responsibility are processes that don't need to be taught to teachers. (T or F)

6. Inclusion provides benefits to more than just students with disabilities. (T or F)

7. Public Law 94-142 requires free appropriate public education for all children in the "least restrictive environment" (LRE). (T or F)

8. Public Law 94-142 gave rise to the Regular education Initiative. (T or F)

9. Public Law 101-457, know as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or the 1990 reauthorization of PL 94- 142 expanded the concept of the " Least restrictive environment" (LRE). (T or F)

10. Inclusion is the commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent possible, in the school and classroom he or she would otherwise attend. (T or F)

11. Inclusion means bringing support services to the child, rather than moving the child to those services. (T or F)

12. Inclusion requires the child benefit from the class, rather than requiring him or her to keep up with other students. (T or F)

13. Inclusion favors newer forms of education service delivery over clustering groups of students with similar disabilities. (T or F)

14. Full inclusion places all students in the regular classroom 100 percent of the school day. (T or F)

15 Full inclusion requires special education staff to provide consultative support to the regular classroom teacher. (T or F)

16. Mainstreaming selectively places special education students in one or more regular education classes. (T or F)

17 Mainstreaming relies on traditional forms of special education delivery. (T or F)

18 Mainstreaming asks, "Where can this student be successful?" (T or F)

19 Continuum of services refers to a full range of educational placement options, from least restrictive to most restrictive. (T or F)

20. Providing for a continuum of services is a requirement of PL 9 4-142. (T or F)

Section III.

Please select the response which best indicates your point of view regarding the following statements. Choices: SA = Strongly Agree; MA = Moderately Agree; U = Undecided; MD = Moderately Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

		SA	MA	U	MD	SD
1.	I am interested in learning more about children with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I have enough knowledge regarding children with disabilities to teach in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I seem to like some children with disabilities better than others.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Students with disabilities and students without disabilities will receive a better education when taught in separate classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I am comfortable around most people with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Including students with disabilities in the regular education classroom impedes the academic and social progress of students without disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I feel that I can take the point of view of a child with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Regular education classrooms are too advanced for students with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Students with severe disabilities can not benefit from the activities of the regular education classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	To include students with disabilities in a regular education classroom, the teacher will have to lower her expectations for students without disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	A regular education teacher can be effective in helping students with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Classrooms that include students with and without disabilities enhance the learning experiences of all students.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I believe that including students with disabilities in the regular education classroom is an important part of a schools curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I believe that regular education teachers should learn a variety of ways to adapt or modify curricula so that students with diverse abilities are able to participate in regular education classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Regular education teachers should learn how to use instructional strategies such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring to help all students access the regular education curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Regular and special education teachers need to learn collaborative teaming strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Regular education teachers need to find effective ways to manage difficult students.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Regular education teachers need to identify resources to help effectively include more students in regular education classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Only people with disabilities can really understand and empathize with other people with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I would prefer to teach children labeled with some disability categories better than others.	1	2	3	4	5

Question 1: What courses should include material related to inclusive education?

Answers 1: All of the methods courses should include material related to inclusive education.

Answer 2: All methods, general education, practica, all education courses should have a component.

Question 2: As a faculty are we interested in team teaching?

Answer 1: Definitely yes.

Answer 2: Yes, this would be great!

Question 3: Should student teaching include an inclusive field component?

If so, how do we insure this?

Answer 1: Yes, they should see inclusion in the classroom.

Answer 2: Should be, but difficult to implement on a consistent basis.